

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached three (3) sheets of drawings include changes to each of Figures 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. The attached three (3) sheets of drawings, which include Figures 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, replace the originally filed drawing sheets 4/6, 5/6, and 6/6, which also include

5 Figures 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

During preparation of the Substitute Specification, as previously discussed, the Applicants recognized Figures 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 as representing prior art. Therefore, to comply with MPEP §608.02(g), the Applicants have amended Figures 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 to be designated by a "(Prior Art)" legend.

10

Attachments: Three (3) Replacement Sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The status of the claims are summarized below.

Claims 1-8 are currently amended.

Claims 1-8 remain pending in the application after entry of this Amendment.

5

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Logan et al. ("Logan") (U.S. Patent No. 5,055,964). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1, the Office has asserted that an insulator as disclosed by
10 Logan (Figure 2, Item 28) is equivalent to the ceramic disc of claim 1. Logan (column 3, lines 62-64) discloses that the insulator 28 is a coating used to coat electrodes. When considering claim 1 in view of the specification, the Applicants respectfully submit that the insulator coating of Logan is clearly not equivalent to the ceramic disc required by claim 1. Furthermore, since the electrodes disclosed by Logan (Figure 2, Items 12 and 14)
15 are not disc-shaped, it is not reasonable to conclude that the insulator coating used to coat those electrodes will be disc-shaped. Therefore, the insulator coating as disclosed by Logan is not equivalent to the ceramic disc having a predetermined thickness as required by claim 1.

Furthermore, claim 1 requires that a planar electrode be positioned in the middle
20 of the ceramic disc relative to a thickness direction of the ceramic disc. The Applicants respectfully submit that the electrodes as disclosed by Logan (Figure 2, Items 12 and 14) are not planar. Also, since Logan does not disclose a ceramic disc, it is not possible for Logan to disclose a planar electrode positioned in the middle of the ceramic disc as required by claim 1.

25 Additionally, claim 1 requires a cooling gas channel formed on a top surface of the ceramic disc, over the electrode, and within an outer periphery edge of the electrode.

Logan simply does not disclose a cooling gas channel having the above-mentioned characteristics. Also, since Logan does not disclose a ceramic disc, it is not possible for Logan to disclose a cooling gas channel formed on a top surface of the ceramic disc.

In accordance with foregoing arguments, the Applicants respectfully submit that

5 Logan does not disclose each and every feature of claim 1 as required to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Therefore, the Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited art of record. Furthermore, since each of dependent claims 2 through 6 ultimately depend from claim 1, the Applicants further submit that dependent claims 2 through 6 are patentable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons

10 provided for claim 1.

The Office has asserted that claim 7 recites operations inherent in the assembly of the apparatus of claim 1. In following, the Office has further asserted that claim 7 is rejected as being anticipated by Logan for the same reasons as applied to claim 1. The applicants respectfully disagree with the Office's assertion and submit that method claim

15 7 stands on its own merit as it is not dependent on either of the apparatus claims 1-6. Also, the Applicants submit that Logan (particularly column 3, line 39 through column 4, line 59) simply does not teach each and every limitation of claim 7 as required to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Therefore, the Applicants submit that claim 7 is patentable over the cited art of record. Furthermore, since claim 8 depends from claim 7,

20 the Applicants submit that claim 8 is patentable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons provided for claim 7.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants kindly request that the Office withdraw the rejections of claims 1-8. The Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims (claims 1-8) are in condition for allowance. Therefore, a notice of allowance is requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present Amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 749-6900, ext. 6914. Also, if any additional fees are due in connection with filing this amendment, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. LAM2P322). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE & PENILLA, L.L.P.



Kenneth D. Wright
Reg. No. 53,795

Martine & Penilla, LLP
710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 170
Sunnyvale, California 94086
Tel: (408) 749-6900
Customer Number 25920